

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/534,282	Applicant(s) GUNSEL ET AL.	
	Examiner Kevin M Bernatz	Art Unit 1773	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Kevin M Bernatz. (3) Benjamin Bai.
 (2) Connie Peelick. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 07 June 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.


(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

EB

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: the Examiner indicated that the argument of unexpected results was convincing, but that the scope of the claims must be commensurate with the showing of unexpected results. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that a single embodiment is not representative of an entire species and that the end points of the acceptable molecular weight or carbon numbers must be shown to possess the same unexpected property if the entire species is claimed. The Examiner noted that care must be given to avoid entry of new matter and that the comparison to ZDOL should be to ZDOL having comparable molecular weight and/or viscosity, since that would be the closest prior art. The Examiner also commented that the applicants' may desire to concentrate on a preferred molecular weight or viscosity range, if support for such embodiments can be found in the disclosed examples. Applicants agreed to consider a declaration addressing these concerns..